

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it carries a valid OMB control number.  
Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

To: Teresa J. Walberg

Total Pages: 3

Phone: 703-308-1327

Fax: 703-872-9306

## Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the  
United States Patent and Trademark Office

on December 6, 2004

Date



Signature

Dana Rumbaugh

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify  
each submitted paper.

Absolute Ren

U.S. Serial No. 10/721,139

Filed November 25, 2003

Confirmation No. 6344

"Heat Exchanger Tubing With Connecting Member And Pins And Methods of  
Heat Exchange"

Attorney Docket: 03-0950 ESCM 370029-00001

Restriction Requirement (2 pages)

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.03 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case.  
Any comments on the amount of time required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark  
Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents,  
Washington, DC 20231.

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

DEC 06 2004

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of	)	
Baolute Ren	)	Examiner Teresa J. Walberg
Serial No. 10/721,139	)	Group Art Unit 3742
Filed November 25, 2003	)	Confirmation No.: 6344
For Heat Exchanger Tubing With	)	Atty. Docket No.: 03-0950
Connecting Member And Fins And	)	
Methods Of Heat Exchange	)	ESCM 370029-00001

**Restriction Requirement**

December 6, 2004

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Restriction Requirement Office Action dated November 17, 2004, where the Examiner required election between method claims based on four sets of Figures. Applicant is not familiar with this type of restriction based on the drawings. The Figures are representations of certain aspects of the invention.

Applicant is not familiar with case law that requires every minute aspect of the invention to be illustrated if it is described in the specification, and submits Fig. 5 should not be separated from Figs. 1-4 nor claims 5 and 6 separated from claims directly related to Figs. 1-4.

However, applicant elects Fig. 1-4. Applicant submits that claim 1 is generic to Figs. 1-4 and relates to tubes (1) having channel (5) therein connected with

plate (3) having fins (7). The Examiner states that no channels are shown in Figs. 1-4 but tube channels (5) are shown-see applicant's specification page 7 para [28].


Applicant submits that the claims 1-4, 8-9, 11 and 19 should be classified as a single group relating to Figs. 1-4 and so elects. Applicant submits those claims all relate to one distinct invention, and are related to a single species per 35 U.S.C. 121. Applicant also requests Fig. 5 be combined with the grouping of Figs. 1-4 and claims 5 and 6 added to the elected above list of claims.

Applicant suggests that the search may be coextensive, for example relating to Fig. 6, and after the search is made requests that the Examiner consider whether all the claims can be prosecuted together.

08840

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel P. Cillo, Esq.

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 25108

Tele. No. 724-337-2778